

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 10/8/2009.
2. Claims 8-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 8, 15 and 21 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 10/8/2009, claims 8, 15 and 21 are amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The claim amendment received on 10/8/2009. The changes are acknowledged and therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections made in a prior Office Action are withdrawn.
4. The claim amendment received on 10/8/2009. The changes are acknowledged and therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections made in a prior Office Action are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,730 issued to Dettinger et al. (hereinafter Dettinger) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0260685 by Pfeiffer et al. (hereinafter Pfeiffer).

Regarding Claims 8, 15 and 21, as far as the claims are understood, Dettinger discloses a method for providing a search query implemented in a computer-readable medium and to execute on a computer, comprising:

providing an Application Programming Interface (API) for receiving a search constraint and a control field identifier, as a graphical user interface receiving search queries with field specifications (Dittinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57; col. 9, lns. 24-38; col. 9, table 1);

providing a search generating module interfaced to the API (i.e., GUI) for automatically generating a search query from the search constraint (i.e., queries issued by the application 240 may be generated in response to user input), **the search constraint defines an operand and an operator for the search query being generated** (i.e., plurality of field specifications) **and wherein the control field identifier defines a control field of a data store from which search results obtained from executing the search query are to be filtered via join** (i.e., the Concrete Query Contribution generated for the current field is added to a Concrete Query Statement) **and the control field identifier is separate and apart from the search constraint** (i.e., field specification with a logical field name and an associated access method) (Dittinger: col. 6, lns. 14-31; col. 7, lns. 50-col. 8, lns. 5; col. 9, lns. 24-38; col. 10, lns. 24-col. 11, lns. 18; col. 13, lns. 26-46; col. 16, lns. 48-59; figs. 3A, 3B & 4).

executing the search query to produce records from the data store, the records are then filtered using a control field value assigned to the control field identifier by joining those records that have the identical values as that which is assigned to the control field

value (Dettinger: col. 8, lns. 18-41; col. 10, lns. 24-col. 11, lns. 18; col. 16, lns. 3-29, col. 18, table III),

Although Dettinger discloses the system performing a searching by adding a current field into a Concrete Query Statement (Dettinger: col. 9, lns. 66-col. 11, lns. 18; fig. 4), Dettinger does not explicitly disclose the system in performing a join operation on the records representing the search results that satisfy the search constraint, however such feature is well known in the art as disclosed in Pfeiffer (Pfeiffer: [0058-0062]) and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Pfeiffer in the system of Dettinger in view of improving the efficiency of the searching system.

Regarding Claim 9, Dettinger and Pfeiffer disclose the method further comprising providing, by the computer, a command option within the API to manually execute the search query (Dettinger: col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, lns. 2-21).

Regarding Claim 10, Dettinger and Pfeiffer disclose the method further comprising presenting, by the computer, the records when the command option is selected (Dettinger: col. 17, lns. 34-65).

Regarding Claim 11, Dettinger and Pfeiffer disclose the method wherein the providing of the search generating module further includes interfacing the API to the search generating module over a network (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31).

Regarding Claim 12, Dettinger and Pfeiger disclose the method wherein the providing the API further includes interfacing the API to one or more automated applications (Dettinger: col. 5, lns. 56-col. 6, lns. 31).

Regarding Claim 16, Dettinger and Pfeiger disclose the system wherein the search query interface includes a Graphical User Interface (GUI) application for receiving the search constraint and the control field identifier and an Application Programming Interface (API) that interfaces the GUI application to the search generating module (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 7, lns. 50-col. 8, lns. 5; col. 16, lns. 3-29, col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, table III).

Regarding Claim 17, Dettinger and Pfeiger disclose the system wherein the search generating module automatically executes the search query and presents the records to the search query interface (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-36 & 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 17, lns. 34-65).

Regarding Claim 18, Dettinger and Pfeiger disclose the system wherein the search generating module executes the search query and presents the records to the search query interface when instructed to do so by the search query interface (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-36 & 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 17, lns. 34-65).

7. Claims 13 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Pfeiger as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 issued to DeLorme et al. (hereinafter DeLorme).

Regarding Claim 13, Dettinger and Pfeiffer do not explicitly disclose the method further comprising interfacing, by the computer, the records automatically after the search query is executed a marketing campaign module, however such a feature is well known in the art as disclosed in DeLorme (DeLorme: col. 31, Ins. 16-41; col. 64, Ins. 56-col. 65, Ins. 13 - as a marketing online advertisement) and it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of DeLorme in the systems of Dettinger and Pfeiffer in view of improving the efficiency of the searching system.

Regarding Claim 22, Dettinger and Pfeiffer do not explicitly disclose the system wherein the system is interfaced to a customer segmentation module, however such a feature is well known in the art as disclosed in DeLorme (DeLorme: col. 9, Ins. 65-col. 10, Ins. 9; col. 33, Ins. 30-52) and it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of DeLorme in the systems of Dettinger and Pfeiffer in view of improving the efficiency of the searching system.

Regarding Claim 23, Although Dettinger and Pfeiffer disclose the system wherein the system is used an instance of the search constraint and wherein the control filed identifier (Dettinger: col. 16, Ins. 3-29, col. 17, Ins. 34-42; col. 18, table III), Dettinger and Pfeiffer do not explicitly disclose the feature of generating a travel customer segmentation population based on a marketing campaign's search constraint representing is a trip identifier. However, such a feature is well known in the art as disclosed in DeLorme discloses (DeLorme: col. 9, Ins. 65-col. 10, Ins. 9; cols. 64, Ins. 56-col. 65, Ins. 13) and it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to modify the teachings of DeLorme in the systems of Dettinger and Pfeigering in view of improving the efficiency of the searching system.

Regarding Claim 24, Dettinger and Pfeigering and DeLorme disclose the system wherein the marketing campaign's search constraint includes at least one of a hotel stay constraint, a rental car constraint, a destination constraint, and a layover constraint (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57) and (DeLorme: col. 14, lns. 24-35).

8. Claims 14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Pfeigering applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,131 issued to Chakrabarti et al. (hereinafter Chakrabarti).

Regarding Claims 14 and 19, Although Dettinger and Pfeigering disclose the method further comprising, by the computer, the search constraint (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57), Dettinger and Pfeigering do not explicitly disclose the feature of generating hierarchies from portions of the records when the search query is executed, wherein each hierarchy represents an aspect. However, such a feature is well known in the art as disclosed in Chakrabarti (Chakrabarti: col. 9, lns. 65- col. 10, lns. 15 - as directing the search to the relevant section) and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Chakrabarti in the systems of Dettinger and Pfeigering in view of improving the efficiency of the searching system.

Regarding Claim 20, Dettinger and Pflieger and Chakrabarti disclose the wherein the hierarchies are linked to fields in the data store and can be activated from the search query interface to present different views of the hierarchies (Dittinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57) & (Chakrabarti: col. 9, lns. 65-col. 10, lns. 15 & 20-33).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONICA M. PYO whose telephone number is (571)272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

01/2010

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161